



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

verschiedene Gottesgelehrte, in the second letter to Dr. Walch:

"Ich setze diesem schneidenden Satze andere vielleicht (dieses "Vielleicht" soll mir aber durchaus nichts *vergeben*) eben so schneidende Sätze entgegen."

T. DIEKHOFF.

University of Michigan.

NOTE ON THE PHOENIX, VERSE 151.

VERSE 59 of the Latin *Phoenix*

"Quae postquam uitae iam mille peregerit annos"

becomes in the Old-English translation

*oð þæt he þusende pisses lifes
wudubearwes weard wintra gebideȝ.*

All the editions that I have seen retain the reading *þusende* in this passage, though Grein cites it as *þusendo* in his Glossary. Thorpe translates it "a thousand," perhaps because he took it for a singular, but more probably from mere ignorance or inadvertence, if we can judge from the general character of his version of the Exeter poetry; Bright marks it in his glossary as plural.

A plural form *þusende* can be explained only by assuming that English has kept the feminine form along with the neuter, as in some of the other tongues of the Group. This involves no serious difficulty, but it would not be easy to find a good reason for a change from singular to plural by the translator, especially in view of the fact that the length of life of the Phoenix is expressed by *þusend wintra* in verse 364 also. I am inclined to explain the form, therefore, as a singular. As is shown by the other Teutonic languages, the word for "thousand" was originally double in form, the stem ending either in *-jo*, (neuter) or in *-jā*, (feminine). The former would give us a nom.-acc. sg. *þusende*, like *ærende*; the usual form *þusend* is the result of the transfer to the simple *o*-stems. An older form is found in many words once or twice, though the later form is the prevailing one, and this may be the present case. An excellent analogy is furnished in verse 590 of the same poem, where we have a nom. sg. *hælende* instead of the usual form *hælend*. (*Hælende* is also found in the *Orosius*, p. 250, ed. Sweet.)

The only other instances of a form *þusende*

that I have found, are cited in Grein's Glossary from the *Psalms*. In civ, 8, we have *on þusende* for the Latin "in mille." If we had a right to assume that the translation is exact, this form would rightly be considered an acc. sg., but it may be dative. The other case is cxviii, 72, where *þusende goldes and seolfres* translates "millia auri et argenti." This may be cited in confirmation of the existence of a feminine form in English, if that theory be adopted to explain the form in the *Phoenix*. It would be quite as easy, however, to assume that the translator changed the word to the singular in this passage, as that it was changed to the plural in the other.

If this explanation is not accepted, I should be inclined to amend the reading to *þusend*. This reading is favored by its occurrence in verse 364, and by the Latin original. The reading in the text may be the result of a blunder on the part of the copyist, who was misled by the following words *pisses lifes*, into supposing that the meaning was "the end of this life," and changed *þusend* accordingly to *þus ende*. For the metre of the hemistich, when thus amended, compare verse 166.

F. A. BLACKBURN.

University of Chicago.

ARRANGEMENT OF THE CANTERBURY TALES.

FOR more than a century this subject has claimed attention, but only a few years ago one of our leaders in criticism said:† —

"No criticism has succeeded in making out anything like a sound and satisfactory arrangement. And even the latest ingenious and applauded attempt of this kind was foredoomed to failure (except by violent and arbitrary proceedings) from the impossibility of reconciling contradictions which the poet did not remove."

The matter is by no means so desperate; all this labor has not been in vain, and criticism has been remarkably successful in removing apparent contradictions and revealing a consistent plan underlying the unfinished work. However, a thorough examination of the subject has convinced me that the accepted ar-

† Ten Brink, *English Literature*, ii, pt. 1 (trans. Robinson), New York, 1893, p. 150.

rangement should be modified in some important particulars, and I hope now to offer a scheme that will represent still more nearly the plan Chaucer must have had in mind. It may be thought not out of place to give, first, a complete but concise account of what has been said concerning the order of the tales. This will put the whole matter in accessible form and make an immediate consideration of the question possible.

For the sake of clearness the subject will be taken up in the following order: I, Historical outline of attempts to put the tales in proper order; II, Stages of the journey; III, Order of the tales.

The following theorems, the acceptance of which is necessary for any attempted solution of the question, may be given without comment.

1. Chaucer left the *Canterbury Tales* unfinished, and we now have what he wrote in whole or in part.²

2. The journey as planned by Chaucer is consistent with reality, even if it did not actually take place, and we are to expect no more contradictions than the unfinished state of the work would justify.

I. HISTORICAL OUTLINE.

Our attention should be directed first to the grouping of the tales in the different MSS., which vary widely, but may be roughly divided into four classes according to the order in which the tales occur.³

- A. 1. Prologue, Knight, Miller, Reeve, Cook.⁴
2. Man of Law.
3. Wife of Bath, Friar, Sompnour.
4. Clerk, Merchant.
5. Squire, Franklin.
6. Doctor, Pardoner.
7. Shipman, Prioress, Sir Thopas, Melibeus, Monk, Nun's Priest.
8. Second Nun, Canon's Yeoman.
9. Manciple, (slightly linked to) Parson.

² See Tyrwhitt, *Canterbury Tales*, 1822, i, p. 162, n. 33; Furnivall, *Temporary Preface*, p. 10 f; Skeat, *Oxford Chaucer*, iii, 373; Ten Brink, *l.c.*, p. 149 f.

³ This summary is taken from the *Oxford Chaucer*, iv, p. xxiii, where Skeat gives in admirable form some of the matter presented in Furnivall's 'Trial Tables' in the *Six-Text Edition*.

⁴ *Gamelyn* is wanting in all MSS. of the A-type, and in some of the D-type.

B. Places 8 before 6. Order: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 6, 7, 9.

C. Not only places 8 before 6, but divides 5 into 5a (Squire) and 5b (Franklin), and places 5a before 3. Order: 1, 2, 5a, 3, 4, 5b, 8, 6, 7, 9.

D. Makes all changes made by C-type and also divides 4 into 4a (Clerk) and 4b (Merchant), and places 4b after 5a. Order: 1, 2, 5a, 4b, 3, 4a, 5b, 8, 6, 7, 9.

The editors of the early printed editions,—Thynne, Stow,⁵ Speght,⁶ Urry, Morell, seem to have been unconscious of any lack of unity in the manuscript scheme; at least they make no mention of it in their notes. The first editor to attempt any study of the order of the tales was Tyrwhitt,⁷ 1775. From the various prologues and scraps of conversation, he makes out a scheme in which he 'flatters himself he has not been unsuccessful in restoring the true order,' at least in part. The order he adopts is that of the Ellesmere MS. (A-type). Tyrwhitt had a very clear grasp of the whole subject and many of his keen observations stand the test of present scholarship.

After Tyrwhitt, nothing was said for many years. Wright, 1847, broke the long silence, but for the most part he only repeats what Tyrwhitt has said.⁸

Dean Stanley,⁹ 1855, gives an entertaining but entirely untrustworthy account of the journey, and is himself guilty of all the 'incongruities' for which he makes Chaucer responsible.

So far we find that no departure has been made from the order given by the MSS. The first note of the new criticism was sounded by J. Dixon in *Notes and Queries*¹⁰ for 1865, where he asks if the tales 'could not be rearranged.'

⁵ See Lounsbury, *Studies in Chaucer*, i, 269.

⁶ Lounsbury, *l.c.*, p. 270 f.

⁷ *The Canterbury Tales* ed. Tyrwhitt, London, 1775-8, and several times reprinted.

⁸ *Canterbury Tales*, ed. Thomas Wright, Percy Society, nos. 24, 25, 26; see first vol., pp. xv-xxiii.

⁹ *Historical Memorials of Canterbury*, 4th ed., London, 1865, pp. 209-214; this chapter was first delivered as a lecture at Canterbury in 1855 (cf. p. 16).

¹⁰ *Notes and Queries*, 3 s., viii, p. 13.

The answer to this was given by F. J. Furnivall,¹¹ 1868,—an answer that is good, as far as it goes, for all time. Some of the most valuable parts of the work are due to Mr. Henry Bradshaw,—for which Furnivall freely gives him credit. Furnivall clearly arranges all the evidence, changes the manuscript order by restoring some displaced tales to their proper positions, and gives an order that is at present accepted as being the most satisfactory solution possible.

J. Koch, 1890, in an essay on *The Chronology of Chaucer's Writings*¹² gives several pages to the arrangement in the *Canterbury Tales*. He says (p. 54);—

“The results of Dr. Furnivall's researches in this respect are very valuable indeed; but as some few doubts remain, it is better to enter upon a new investigation than simply to follow his explanations.”

Now as a matter of fact Koch in no way solves these ‘doubts,’ but merely amuses himself—and the reader—by guessing. His meaning is not always perfectly clear, and he seems to agree with Furnivall after all, except in the division of time.

Henry Morley,¹³ 1890, considers the question at second hand, in a rambling way that claims scarcely a moment's attention.

The opinion of Ten Brink,¹⁴ 1893, has already been quoted; he merely accepts the *tales* as they are given in the most careful MSS.

Skeat,¹⁵ 1894, brings the list to a close; he adopts almost without variation the work presented by Furnivall, but states the case with great clearness and simplicity. In one instance he objects to a change made by Furnivall and falls back on the order of the MSS.

¹¹ *A Temporary Preface to the Six-Text Edition of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales*, Pt. I, London, 1868 (Chauc. Soc. Second Series, no. 3). See also Warton's *Hist. Eng. Poetry*, ed. Hazlitt, London, 1871, vol. ii, p. 379.

¹² Published (with additional notes by Skeat and an occasional remark by Furnivall) for the Chaucer Society, 1890, Second Series, no. 27.

¹³ *English Writers*, vol. v, 1890.

¹⁴ *Geschichte der englischen Litteratur*, ii. Bd., Strassburg, 1893. The first part of vol. ii was published in Berlin, 1889; English translation of the latter by Robinson, New York, 1893.

¹⁵ *The Complete Work of Geoffrey Chaucer*, ed. W. W. Skeat, Oxford, 1894, vol. iii, p. 371 f., and vol. v. This is commonly known as the *Oxford Chaucer*.

II. STAGES OF THE JOURNEY.

The allusions to time and place are so scattered and incidental, that it is impossible to make out the author's scheme with any certainty, but a reasonable degree of probability must be admitted.

The theory of a one day's journey was for a long time tacitly accepted as a matter of course. Tyrwhitt, with his usual acuteness, noticed that many difficulties could be avoided by taking more than one day for the journey, but he contented himself with only a suggestion.¹⁶ Long after the notion of a one-day's journey had been completely disproved, Morley came forward with it,¹⁷ and Skeat, in the fifth volume of the *Oxford Chaucer* (which has just appeared), seems carelessly to admit its possibility.¹⁸ Aside from the spirit of the whole composition, a little arithmetic is all that is needed to show how ridiculous such a supposition is. Allowing twelve hours for travelling, each pilgrim would have but little over twenty minutes in which to tell his story while jolting along at the rate of five miles an hour;—not time enough for reading it! No further thought need be given to this theory.

References to time in the text require at least two mornings;

Lo, Depeford! and it is half-way pryme,
A 3906¹⁹ (*Miller's Tale*).

and,

And seyde, 'sires, now in the morwe-tyde
Out of your hostelrye I saugh you ryde.
G 588 (*Canon's Yeoman's Prol.*)

The other two references to morning, 'it is pryme,' F 73 (*Squire's Tale*), and 'ten of the

¹⁶ *Canl. Tales*, 1822, iv, 324.

¹⁷ *Eng. Writers*, v, 310 f.

¹⁸ "If, as Mr. Furnivall supposes, the time of the telling of the *Canterbury Tales* be taken to be longer than one day, we may suppose the *Man-of-Lawes* tale to begin the stories told on the *second* morning of the journey, April 18. Otherwise, we must suppose all the stories in Group A to precede it, which is not impossible, if we suppose the pilgrims to have started early in the morning." *Oxford Chaucer*, v, 132. This paragraph is all the more remarkable because such an admission directly opposes the position Skeat has taken elsewhere. See *Oxford Chaucer*, iii, 375, and v, 415.

¹⁹ All references are to the text of the *Oxford Chaucer*, where the numbering is that of the *Six-Text Edition*.

clocke,' B 14 (*Man of Law's Prolog.*), may refer to other mornings, but do not necessarily.²⁰

B 14 goes very well with A 3906; and F 73, with G 588. Now allowing only two days, the reference in the *Canon's Yeoman's Prologue* would leave forty-six miles for the first day, hardly an improvement on the one-day theory, so we must admit at least three mornings or two days and one half. This is the scheme Koch adopts,²¹ making the pilgrims travel thirty miles the first day, sixteen the second, and ten the third. Furnivall had already thought of this but rejected it in favor of three and one half days,²² and Skeat follows Furnivall.²³

This plan is the most probable one, and is to be adopted for the following reasons.

1. It presents fewer difficulties in arranging the tales.

2. It makes an almost equal division of the distance.

3. Records of contemporary journeys between London and Canterbury not requiring haste, give very strong confirmatory evidence and may be said to settle the question. From the records of the journeys²⁴ of Queen Isabella in 1358, and of King John of France in 1360, we find that to travel from London to Canterbury required between three and four days, and that the usual places for spending the night were Dartford, Rochester, and Ospringe. On looking at much later journeys,²⁵ that of Henry VIII and Charles V of Germany in 1522, and the journey of Anne of Cleves on her way to marry Henry VIII in 1540, we find that the rate of travel remained unchanged and the old stopping-places were still used.

On this evidence we are justified in assuming Chaucer's plan to have been as follows:—

First day: travel from Southwark to Dartford, fifteen miles, and spend the night.

Second day: arrive at Rochester, fifteen miles from Dartford, and spend the second night.

²⁰ Skeat has this very confusedly and, indeed, quite erroneously stated: *Oxford Chaucer*, iii, 376.

²¹ *l. c.*, p. 62 f.

²² See Koch, *l. c.*, p. 59 n. 2, and *Temporary Preface*.

²³ *Oxford Chaucer*, iii, 376, and v, 415.

²⁴ *Archæologia*, xxxv, 461; *Stanley Hist. Mem.*, p. 237; *Temp. Pref.*, pp. 13-15; *Oxford Chaucer*, v, 415.

²⁵ See Koch, *l. c.*, p. 79; the note is by Furnivall.

Third Day: stop for dinner at Sittingbourne (like King John) after traveling ten miles, and spend the night at Ospringe, six miles farther on, forty-six miles from London.

Fourth day: travel the remaining ten miles and reach Canterbury.

III. ORDER OF THE TALES.

The *Canterbury Tales* is made up of fragments, that is, of groups of tales which are so joined by references in the text that they cannot be separated ('inseparably linked,' to use Tyrwhitt's phrase), while the groups themselves are not directly connected. There are nine of these fragments, but the group headed by the *Knight's Tale* comes first, and there is no doubt that the *Parson's Tale* comes last, so only seven groups are left for us to arrange. Allusions to places on the road and to the time of day, or references to preceding tales, are the chief means for bridging over the gaps between the groups and determining the intended order. The first group is composed of the *General Prologue*, and the tales of the Knight, Miller, Reeve, and Cook, and the *Cook's Tale* is unfinished, thus leaving this group unconnected with any other. As we have seen, the first night was probably spent at Dartford, and when the Reeve began his story at half-past seven in the morning, they were no farther than Greenwich, five miles from London (A 3906-7), so Chaucer evidently intended some stories more for the first day. Furnivall suggests that Chaucer meant to insert here the tales of some at least 'of the five City-Mechanics and the Ploughman'; Skeat thinks that the *Yeoman's Tale* (never written) was to have formed part of this group,²⁶ arguing this very cleverly from the fitness for a Yeoman of the non-Chaucerian *Tale of Gamelyn*, which so many MSS. insert after the *Cook's Tale*.

Now the Man of Law mentions ten o'clock in the morning, so Furnivall puts his story next in order on the following morning.²⁷ To Bradshaw belongs the credit of the next step. At the end of the *Man of Law's Tale* occur a few lines, in which a rude fellow pushes aside

²⁶ *Oxford Chaucer*, iii, 377 and 380-1.

²⁷ Almost all the MSS. have this order;—Hengwrt, Trin. Coll. Oxf. 49, Christ Ch. 152 have not.

the Parson and volunteers a story of his own. Most MSS. call this rude fellow the 'Squire,' some of them read the 'Sompnour,' and one (Arch. Seld. B 14) has the 'Shipman.' This, says Mr. Bradshaw, is right; these lines are the *Shipman's Prologue*; such language and behavior would be altogether inappropriate for the Squire, and the *Sompnour's Prologue* and *Tale* are both complete. Tyrwhitt had noticed this,²⁸ and has already prefixed these lines to the *Shipman's Tale* in his edition. Mr. Bradshaw goes a step further. The Man of Law said;—

I can right now no thrifty tale seyn,
B 46,

and the third line of this *Shipman's Prologue* reads,

This was a thrifty tale for the nones!
B 1165.

thus linking these lines to the *Man-of-Law's Tale*; so that the *Prologue* cannot be moved up to the *Tale*; but the *Tale* must be placed after the *Prologue*, which thus links it to the *Man-of-Law's Tale*.

A geographical reference proves that this is the proper place for the group headed by the *Shipman's Tale*. A line in the *Monk's Prologue* refers to Rochester (B 3116), and Rochester is the next large town after Greenwich on the road to Canterbury.

This change also does away with the inconsistency of having a mention of Sittingbourne (in the *Sompnour's Tale*) precede that of Rochester, as is demanded by all the MSS.; Sittingbourne is ten miles farther on the road. With the *Shipman's Tale* must be brought up the whole group with which it is connected, so we have the tales of the Shipman, Prioress, Sir Thopas, Melibe, Monk, and Nun's Priest following in order the tale of the Man of Law. This would bring the pilgrims to Rochester, the end of the second day's journey (according to Furnivall), thirty miles from London.

Koch's order does not differ from the sequence that has been given above, but puts all these stories on the first day and makes Rochester the stopping-place for the first night.

This order of the tales is not altogether satisfactory to me, and I would place the

Doctor-Pardoner group before the *Man-of-Law's Tale* on the morning of the second day, which, I think, is its intended place. It is first necessary to do away with a textual difficulty.

The Shipman promises to tell a tale that shall 'waken al this companye,'

But it schal nat ben of philosophie,
Ne *physices*, ne termes queinte of lawe.
B 1188-9.

The word 'physices' is Skeat's reading, and he says in a foot-note to l. 1189,

"Tyrwhitt has *of physike*; the MSS. have the unmeaning word *phislyas* (Sloane *phillyas*; Ln. *fisleas*); read *physices*."

In his note on this line²⁹ he says further:—

"It is plain that the unmeaning words *phislyas* and *phillyas*, as in the MSS., must be corruptions of some difficult form. I think that form is certainly *physices*, with reference to the Physics of Aristotle, here conjoined with 'philosophy' and 'law' in order to include the chief forms of medieval learning. Aristotle was only known, in Chaucer's time, in Latin translations, and *Physices Liber* would be a possible title for such a translation. Lewis and Short's Lat. Dict. gives '*physica*, gen. *physicæ*, and *physice*, gen. *physices*, f., = *Φυσικα*, natural science, natural philosophy, physics.'

That Chaucer should use the gen. *physices* alone, is just in his usual manner; cf. *Judicium*, B. 3236; *Eneidos*, B. 4549; *Metamorphoseos*, B. 93. Tyrwhitt's reading of *physike* gives the same sense."

All these words might have been spared; they are wide of the mark. An examination of all the MSS. in which this line occurs³⁰ shows seven readings; this *Prologue* is wanting in the so-called edited texts.

- | | |
|----------------------|--|
| 1. <i>phislyas</i> : | MS. Arch. Seld. B. 14.
Corp. (Oxford) MS.
Royal MS. 8 C ii.
Lichfield MS. |
| <i>physlyas</i> : | MS. I. 1. 3. 26. Camb. Univ. Lib. |
| <i>fyslyas</i> : | Royal MS. 17 D xv. |
| <i>fisleas</i> : | Lansdowne MS. 851. |
| 2. <i>phislays</i> : | Laud MS. 739. |
| 3. <i>phillyas</i> : | Sloane MS. 1685. |
| <i>phillyas</i> : | Barlow MS. 20. |
| <i>philiias</i> : | Sloane MS. 1686. |

²⁹ Oxford Chaucer, v, p. 167.

³⁰ See the print of the *Shipman's Prologue* in the *Six-Text Edition*.

²⁸ 'Intr. Discourse,' § xxxi.

4. *phisilias*: Harl. MS. 7333.
 Rawl. MS. Misc. 1133.
 Trin. Coll. Cambr. MS. R. 3.3.
physilias: Helmingham MS.
 5. *phiscians*: Camb. Univ. Libr. MS. Mm 2. 5.
 6. *phisik*: Hatton MS. 1.
 Trin. Coll. Cambr. MS. R. 215.
physik: Rawl. MS. Poet. 141.
fysike: Rawl. MS. Poet. 149.
 7. *Ne spöke no termes* &c. MS. Harl. 1738.

It will be seen from this table that there is a form 'phislyas' (> 'phillyas' by assimilation) or 'phisilias,' which occurs too persistently to be cast aside as 'unmeaning,' although it was evidently not a very familiar word. One scribe did not understand it at all and changed the reading of the line; another substituted the common word 'phiscians,' while four read 'phisik.' Regarding merely the probabilities of the question, the meaning of the word would seem to be thus indicated; the interpretation is too consistent to be called a blunder. But we may go further than this; the Epinal, the Erfurt, and the Corpus Glossaries³¹ all have the gloss, 'phisillos: *leceas*'; which establishes with comparative certainty both the form and the meaning. Now 'phisillos' is not a classical word and is presumably a corrupt form;³² I have not yet been able to find an occurrence of it later than these glossaries, which belong to the eighth and ninth centuries, but Hessels says:³³—

"An examination of the Corpus Glossary brings out the fact that, though there is an interval of eight centuries between it and the *Catholicon Anglicum*, which is dated 1483, both these glossaries, written in England, stand in precisely the same stage with regard to deviations from the classical spelling of

³¹ See Sweet's *Oldest Eng. Texts*, p. 84 & p. 87, and *An Eighth-century Latin-Anglo-Saxon Glossary*, ed. by J. H. Hessels, Cambridge, 1890, p. 93.

³² Wülcker (*Iconbularies*, 39, 21), Sweet, and Diefenbach think it is for 'physicos' (-us). Skeat's identification with 'physica' or 'physice'—natural science is, of course, not to be thought of; the gloss alone is sufficient proof against this meaning, but Skeat has also looked into the wrong dictionary! In Late Latin the classical meaning of *physicus* and *physica* seems to be completely lost, and we have only *physicus* = 'medicus,' *physica* = 'medicina.' See *Du Cange*, s. v. *Uar-pentier*, &c.

³³ *l. c.* Introduction, p. xx.

Latin caused by pronunciation, and changes caused by misreadings of certain letters."

This, then, gives us good reason to carry the form 'phisillos' into Chaucer's time—the slightly differing manuscript readings are quite natural—and the old glossaries together with the scribal interpretations leave little room to doubt that its meaning is 'physician' or 'physic.'

We may now take up the question of the proper place for the Doctor-Pardoner group, which I place before the *Man-of-Law's Tale*³⁴ for the following reasons.

1. The *Shipman's Prologue* closes with these lines:

My Toly body shal a tale telle,
 And I shal clinken yow so mery a belle,
 That I shal waken al this compaignye;
 But it shal nat ben of philosophye,
 Ne *phislyas*,³⁵ ne termes queinte of lawe;
 Ther is but litel Latin in my mawe.

B 1185-90.

Now 'phislyas' and 'termes queinte of lawe' seem to point directly at the Doctor, and the Man of Law, and 'of philosophy' very fitly characterises the *Pardoner's Tale*; in fact, the *Pardoner's Tale* is the only one of these that could be called 'philosophical' even in a loose sense. It is evidently the intention of the Shipman to compare the story he shall tell with those that have already been told on that morning, and here we find a distinct reference to each of them; denying the reference, we have no good reason for the collocation. And furthermore, the *Pardoner's Prologue* and *Tale* are demanded to give point to the line,

Ther is but litel Latin in my mawe.

For, although the Doctor and the Man of Law, as well as the Pardoner, mentioned Latin authors by name, the Pardoner is the only one who uses any Latin quotation. He takes as his text 'Radix malorum est Cupidi-

³⁴ Koch (*l. c.*, p. 59) suggests that Chaucer 'had planned to insert one or two more tales before the Man-of-Law's, or rather between this one and the Shipman's, perhaps the Doctor's and the Pardoner's.' The latter alternative is, of course, impossible; the link between the *Man of Law* and the *Shipman* cannot be broken. Koch does not make a point of this suggestion and gives it up (p. 60) as lightly as he has brought it forward.

³⁵ The most common manuscript reading.

das;’ he quotes this twice (C 334 and C 426), and also boasts that he can speak in Latin (C 344).

2. This position of the Doctor-Pardoner group would give a decidedly better application to the Host’s remark³⁶ in the *Man-of-Law’s End-link (Shipman’s Prologue)*,—

I see wel that ye lerned men in lore
Can moche good, by goddes dignitee!
B 1168-9.

for the Host would then refer not only to the Man of Law and the Parson, but also to the Doctor and the Pardoner.³⁷

3. The morning hour³⁸ required by the place I have given this group, fits in very well with two references.³⁹ After the quarrel between the Host and the Pardoner, the Knight, acting as peace-maker, called upon them to kiss, and laugh, and play as before; and the poet adds,

Anon they kiste, and riden forth hir weye.
C 968.

This, as Furnivall says,⁴⁰ sounds more like the

³⁶ Koch, *l. c.*, p. 59, gives this as the ground for his suggestion which has already been quoted.

³⁷ Skeat thinks the Pardoner would not be called ‘a lerned man in lore,’ for ‘the proof that this is the very last title the Host would have bestowed on the Pardoner, is given in C 942-968, where the Host’s contempt of the Pardoner is expressed in the strongest terms which he could command.’ See *Oxford Chaucer*, iii, 419. Tyrwhitt (*Intr. Discourse*, § xxxi) and Koch (*l. c.*, p. 59) saw no inconsistency in such a title, and they are right; Skeat has not read his text attentively enough. It is true that the Host had expressed his contempt of the Pardoner in no measured terms, and the Pardoner became too angry for speech; then the Host said,

—— ‘I wol no lenger pleye
With thee, ne with noon other angry man.’
C. 958-9.

This makes it evident that the Host was only joking,—and the Pardoner himself began it all by offering to let the Host kiss the relics first because he was ‘most envoluped in sinne.’

The Pardoner might well be included among the ‘lerned men’ on account of his Latin quotations and his philosophical discourse, and the following lines from the *General Prologue* (A 709 f.) show that Chaucer intended us to have such an idea:

But trewely to tellen, atte laste,
He was in chirche a noble ecclesiaste.
Wel coude he rede a lessoun or a storie,
But alderbest he song an offertorie.

³⁸ The *Man-of-Law’s Prologue* mentions ten o’clock.

³⁹ Furnivall uses these references to fix this group on the third morning.

⁴⁰ *Temp. Pref.*, p. 27.

beginning than the end of a day’s journey and naturally points to a morning hour.

Then, when the Host calls on the Pardoner for his story, he says he will first stop ‘at this ale-stake,’ and will ‘both drinke, and eten of a cake’ (C 321-2). Furnivall says;⁴¹—

“This bite on the cake and draught of ale leave no doubt on my mind that the Pardoner wanted a snack, by way of breakfast, before telling his tale; and that before-dinner suits the circumstances much better than after; for if he had had a hearty meal at 9 or 10, after a morning’s ride, he would not have wanted a luncheon between that and supper at 4 or 5. A draught of ale he might have felt the need of, but the bite on a cake means before-breakfast.”

I think Mr. Furnivall makes a trifle too much of this incident; the Pardoner was evidently a man to whom a bottle of beer and a ‘cracker’ (transferring the scene to nineteenth-century America) were never out of place. This may be taken, though, as evidence, for what it is worth.

4. There is no other evidence in the Doctor-Pardoner group as to its place among the other groups, and there is absolutely nothing that conflicts with the position I have assigned to it, while all the evidence we have sustains this grouping.⁴²

I think, then, we may write down the order; Knight—Miller—Reeve—Cook; Doctor-Pardoner; Man of Law; Shipman—Prioress—Sir Thopas—Melibe—Monk—Nun’s Priest.

We have now followed the pilgrims to Rochester, where they must have spent the night. What then was the first story told in the morning? Furnivall puts the Doctor-Pardoner group here on account of the references to a morning hour, but we have already found a better place for this group. Koch says we may also put the Squire-Franklin group here, letting it precede the *Doctor’s Tale*, although he does not insist upon this change. I

⁴¹ *Temp. Pref.*, p. 25.

⁴² It has already been mentioned that Skeat objects in one instance to the order given by Furnivall; it is in regard to the position of the Doctor-Pardoner group. No good, he says, has been effected by its removal and it should be left after the *Franklin’s Tale*, where it is found in the best MSS. He has been forced to follow Furnivall’s arrangement, but notes that the right order of the groups is: A, B, D, E, F, C, G, H, I. See *Oxford Chaucer*, iii, 434.

shall presently show that the last morning of the journey is the proper place for this group. The fragment headed by the Wife of Bath is the one we must next bring up; it is called for by a geographical allusion. The Sompnour refers twice to Sittingbourne (D 845 f. and 2294), and as this is the next important town after Rochester, this is certainly the place for the stories of the Wife of the Bath, the Friar, and the Sompnour, which are 'inseparably linked.' Sittingbourne is only ten miles from Rochester, not enough for a day's journey, so Furnivall suggests⁴³ that the pilgrims merely halted there for dinner. Now the tales of the Clerk and the Merchant form altogether another group, although most of the MSS. separate them. There is however a link connecting these tales⁴⁴ which was observed by the scribes of the 'edited MSS.,' and was made still stronger by their insertion of some connecting lines. This is the link; the *Clerk's Tale* ends with the line,

And lat him care, and wepe, and wringe, and waille!
E 1222.

and the first line of the *Merchant's Prolog.* is,

Weping and wayling, care, and other sorwe.
E 1213.

The Merchant also mentions 'Grisildis grete pacience' (E 1224), showing that the *Clerk's Tale* is fresh in his mind.⁴⁵

The Clerk plainly refers to the story told by the Wife of Bath;

For which heer, for the wyves love of Bathe,
Whos lyf and al hir secte god mayntene
In heigh maistrye,— E 1170-2.

and the Merchant mentions the fact that she has already told her story;

The Wyf of Bathe, if ye han understonde,
Of marriage, which we have on honde
Declared hath ful wel in litel space.
E 1685-7.

So it is clear, then, that this group was meant to follow the group headed by the Wife of Bath, most likely on the same day, and probably immediately after leaving Sittingbourne. This position is strengthened by a line which,

⁴³ *Temp. Pref.*, p. 25.

⁴⁴ 'As strong a link as any in the whole work,' says Furnivall, *Temp. Pref.*, p. 27.

⁴⁵ See Tyrwhitt, 'Intr. Discourse,' § xxi.

I believe, has not yet been noticed. The Host is speaking:—

'Sir clerk of Oxenford,' our hoste sayde,
'Ye ryde as coy and stille as dooth a mayde,
Were newe spoused, sitting at the bord;
This day ne herde I of your tonge a word.'

E 1-4

If the hour were early morning, the Host would not say he had not heard the Clerk speak a word 'this day;' a considerable part of the day must have passed, and after dinner at Sittingbourne gives the required situation.

These five stories are the only ones that may be assigned to the third day's journey—a very small allotment,—but some of the unwritten stories would doubtless have found a place here. From this point the incompleteness of the *Canterbury Tales* becomes more and more evident, and this very fact is in some sort a guarantee for the genuineness of our scheme; defects are found just where they ought to be in such a work,—in the latter part. According to Furnivall's scheme the night after the third day's journey is spent at Ospringe. The *Canon's Yeoman's Prologue* mentions Boughton-under-Blean and intimates that the night's resting-place was just five miles to the rear; measuring back we get Ospringe, which was one of the usual stopping-places between London and Canterbury.

This brings us to the last day's journey, and we must decide, if possible upon the first story told on the fourth morning.

The Squire-Franklin group stands unlinked to any other and has the following reference to time:

I wol nat tarien yow, for it is pryme,
F 73.

So Furnivall answers the question with this group, but he seems to have no reason for putting it on this particular morning. Koch thinks the morning of the preceding day would do just as well. It is to be noted, however, that when the Doctor-Pardoner group and the group headed by the Shipman are moved to their proper places, the Squire-Franklin group will fall in the very order Furnivall has chanced upon; and this is the order I think we can sustain with some reason.

Let us examine the opening lines of the

Franklin's Tale (F 729-802); the passage is too long to quote entire. After 'many a labour, many a greet emprise,' a worthy knight is accepted as husband by a lady of 'heigh kinrede.' He swore 'of his free wil' never to take upon himself any 'maistrye agayn hir wil,' keeping only the name of 'soveraynree;tee;' and she, not to be outdone in generosity, vowed ever to be his 'humble trewe wyf.' This mutual trust and obedience, continues the Franklin, is the only true basis of marriage as well as of love. Love will not be 'constreyned by maistrye,' it is free as a spirit; and women desire liberty as well as men. Yet

Patience is an heigh vertu certeyn;
For it venquisseth, as thise clerkes seyn,⁴⁶
Things that rigour sholde never atteyne.

Patience is also necessary, for there is no one in the world 'that he ne dooth or seith somtyme amis'; so she promised the knight that he should never find her wanting in 'suffrance,' and thus took him for 'hir servant and hir lord,'

Servant in love, and lord in mariage.

The stories of the wife of Bath and of the Clerk also treat of the relation of man and wife. The Clerk shows that the most patient, unquestioning obedience of a wife to the most capricious and unjust demands of her husband, is finally rewarded; and such a woman is held up as an example to womankind. The Wife of Bath takes the opposite view; she says that the chief desire and delight of woman is to have the upper hand 'as wel over hir housbond as hir love,' and prays that

Iesu shorte hir lyves
That wol nat be governed by hir wywes.

Now the Franklin, as we have seen, discusses both these views and shows the limitations of each. The key-note of the Wife-of-Bath's story is 'mastery,' and of the Clerk's 'patience;' the Franklin uses these two words repeatedly and contrasts them with great nicety, taking a measure of each for his own conception of married life, which is a much higher conception than the Wife's or the Clerk's. The natural inference of all this is that the Franklin's story was meant to come

⁴⁶ See *Oxford Chaucer*, v. p. 388, for sources of the quotation.

after the other two; not to admit this would be to accase Chaucer of a gross artistic blunder.

Then, too, the Franklin uses some phrases seemingly with conscious reference to the words of the Wife of Bath. She says (in the person of the knight, who is speaking):

'Wommen desyren to have sovereyntee
As wel over hir housbond as hir love,
And for to been in maistrye him above;
This is your moste desyr.'—

D 1038-41.

These lines contain the point of the whole story; up to this time everything has been in suspense. Compare with this the following quotations from the Franklin:

Of his free wil he swoor hir as a knight,
That never in al his lyf he, day ne night,
Ne sholde up-on him take no maistrye.

Save that the name of soveraynetee,
That wolde he have for shame of his degree.

F 745-7 and 751-2.

Love wol nat ben constreyned by maistrye;
Whan maistrye comth, the god of love anon
Beceth hise wings, and farewel! he is gon!⁴⁷

F 764-6.

Thus hath she take hir servant and hir lord,
Servant in love, and lord in mariage.

F 792-3.

The wording is in some points remarkably similar, but the connection in thought is still closer; it is hard to deny that the Franklin intentionally refers to the Wife's story, after carefully reading his introductory passage. Still, even if this be not so, we could not place the *Franklin's Tale* before the Wife-of-Bath's; to do this would be to anticipate the point of her story and take away the telling effect of the denouement. We may then with reason demand that the Squire-Franklin group be placed after the *Wife's Tale*, and, consequently, after the tales of the Clerk and the Merchant also.

Now the Wife-Friar-Sompnour group was told just before reaching Sittingbourne, presumably after considerable travel, and the Clerk probably began his story soon after leaving town, so the *Squire's Tale*, with its mention of 'pryme,' could not come on this day. There is only one place left for it,—the next morning, and we may now with some

⁴⁷ This passage seems to be founded on some lines in *Le Roman de la Rose*. See *Oxford Chaucer*, v, p. 388.

confidence begin the last day's story-telling with the Squire-Franklin group.⁴⁸

The remaining groups may be disposed of in few words. The group composed of the *Second Nun's* and the *Canon's Yeoman's Tales* must come next; the situation is fully given in the link (G 554-719): the time is morning and the place is 'Boughton under Blee,'⁴⁹ only a few miles from Canterbury.

The *Manciple's Tale* is unconnected with the Canon's Yeoman's, but must follow it closely on account of its mention of 'Bob-up-and-down,' which is usually identified with Harbledown, the next place to Boughton on the road to Canterbury. There seems to be little doubt of this identification although it has given rise to much dispute.⁵⁰

The only story left is the Parson's, which seems at first to be inseparably linked to the Manciple's; the first line of the *Parson's Prologue* reads:—

By that the maunciple hadde his tale al ended.

Then follows the time of day and an exact description of the shadow then cast; some of the MSS. have ten o'clock, some two, one five, but most of the best MSS. have four;⁵¹ this latter hour alone can be right, as is conclusively shown by the length of the shadow given for that time. So there is, after all, a break between the *Manciple's Tale*, which

⁴⁸ Ten Brink and Morley still hold that the tales of the Clerk, Merchant, Squire, and Franklin form one group. There is no good reason for thus connecting them. See *Oxford Chaucer*, iii, p. 462. Ten MSS. use the Squire-Franklin link for the prologue to the *Merchant's Tale*. See *Six-Text Ed.*, p. xii.*

⁴⁹ See *Oxford Chaucer*, v, p. 416, and notes in other editions of the *Canterbury Tales*. A. S. Cook in *MOD. LANG. NOTES*, March, 1893, col. 129, notes that Boughton under Blean 'seems to have been used as a sort of proverbial expression.' For the good or bad character of Boughton, see *Athenaeum* for 1868, p. 886 (also *Temp. Pref.*, p. 31, n. 2), for 1869, p. 350; *Notes and Queries* 4 s., iv, p. 509; 4 s., v, p. 71; 4 s., v, p. 159.

⁵⁰ See the following references for a discussion of Bob-up-and-down: Tyrwhitt, 'Intr. Discourse,' § xxxix; Wright, *Cant. Tales*, iii, p. 63, n.; Skeat, *Oxford Chaucer*, v, p. 435; Furnivall, *Temp. Pref.*, p. 31, n. 2; Morley, *English Writers*, v, 344; *Notes and Queries*, 3 s., viii, p. 13; 4 s., iv, p. 509; 4 s., v, p. 71; 4 s., v, p. 159; *Athenaeum* for 1868, pp. 535, 612, 652, 724, 886, and for 1869, p. 350.

⁵¹ See Tyrwhitt, 'Intr. Discourse,' § xli; Skeat, *Oxford Chaucer*, v, p. 444.

was told in the morning,⁵² and the *Parson's Tale*, which must be dated four o'clock in the afternoon.

I must agree with Furnivall⁵³ that 'either the Manciple's name must have been introduced by a copier after Chaucer's death, or that Chaucer himself had not revised this link or prologue so as to remove the contradiction.'

The *Parson's Tale* was meant to close the series of stories told on the journey to Canterbury; nothing is said anywhere about the return journey, and the theory that any of the existing tales were intended for it, is now so generally discarded that it need be only mentioned.⁵⁴ We may then definitely assign six tales to the last day: those of the Squire, the Franklin, the Second Nun, the Canon's Yeoman, the Manciple, and the Parson. This makes our list complete and leaves seven pilgrims that have not taken part in the story-telling,—the Yeoman, the Haberdasher, the Carpenter, the Weaver, the Dyer, the Tapicer, and the Plowman.

To review:—

1. The orders⁵⁵ of MSS. of the Ellesmere type, adopted by Tyrwhitt, is:
 - A. Prologue, Knight, Miller, Reeve, Cook.
 - Ba. Man of Law.
 - D. Wife of Bath, Friar, Sompnour.
 - E. Clerk, Merchant.
 - F. Squire, Franklin.
 - C. Doctor, Pardoner.
 - Bb. Shipman, Prioress, Sir Thopas, Melibeus, Monk, Nun's Priest.
 - G. Second Nun, Canon's Yeoman.
 - H. Manciple.
 - I. Parson.
2. Furnivall:—A, Ba Bb, C, D, E, F, G, H, I. Three changes in sequence:
 - a. Bb to follow Ba,—demanded by B 46 and B 1165 (Bradshaw).
 - b. C. to precede D,—mostly arbitrary.

⁵² That the *Manciple's Tale* belongs to the morning, is indicated by the scene described in the *Manciple's Prologue*; Furnivall shows that this might have happened any time before twelve o'clock (*Temp. Pref.*, pp. 34-6).

⁵³ *Temp. Pref.*, p. 36.

⁵⁴ Ten Brink still holds that the *Manciple's Tale* was probably intended for the beginning of the journey home.

⁵⁵ For the sake of convenience I take Furnivall's order as the norm.

- c. F then precedes G,—position not established.
3. Koch:—A, Ba, [C?], Bb, [F?], C, D, E, F, G, H, I—suggests some change, but seems finally to agree with Furnivall.
4. Skeat:—A, Ba Bb, D, E, F, C, G, H, I—objects to arbitrary changes and falls back upon the MSS.
5. The Scheme I think will hold is:—A, C, Ba Bb, D, E, F, G, H, I.
- a. That C precedes B is indicated by B 1185-90.
- b. That F follows D and E is implied by a comparison of F 729-802 with the *Wife's Tale* and the *Clerk's Tale*, and (specifically) of F 745-7, 751-2, 764-6, 792-3, with D 1038-41.

This scheme links together for the first time all of the *Canterbury Tales*; and it is a remarkable fact that we can find any consistent plan in a work so incomplete. Chaucer had evidently well thought out nearly every detail.

GEORGE SHIPLEY.

Johns Hopkins University.

FRENCH DRAMA.

Ruy Blas par VICTOR HUGO. Edited with introduction and explanatory notes by SAMUEL GARNER, Ph. D., Department of Modern Languages, U. S. Naval Academy. Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1894.

VICTOR HUGO's *Ruy Blas* is one of those plays, of which an edition for college students, and for students of French literature in general, was an imperative need, and it is a pleasure to record the judgment that Dr. Garner has fulfilled his task in a most satisfactory and scholarly manner. The edition before us is one of which nothing but good can be said from cover to cover.

Ruy Blas is not a play which will ordinarily be placed in the hands of beginners, and the whole critical apparatus of the edition is therefore addressed primarily to the advanced student of French literature. It is a pleasure to see so sober and dignified a handling of annotations as that of Dr. Garner; the notes are refreshingly free from that over-anno-

tation which has become such a burden in so many of our present text-books, and, be it said parenthetically, to which students rarely refer except when they are on the point of a failure in the class-room.

Hugo's plays will not generally be read for the sole purpose of impressing the rules of French syntax; an editor of these texts must therefore bear in mind the needs of the student, who is to gain through his reading a knowledge of Hugo, the man, as well as of Hugo the dramatist and the champion of the Romantic movement. In his preface Garner says, that between *Hernani* and *Ruy Blas* the latter has slightly the lead as a favorite, in that the poet has therein reached a higher plane of dramatical lyricism. This statement may be concurred in, and still it is evident, that any student who has read *Ruy Blas* and is ignorant of the interesting battle about *Hernani*, is still far from the understanding of the real nature of the Romantic Drama. That this is true, is shown by the edition before us, for in the introduction and notes there is scarcely a reference to the storm that preceded this calm. And still the omission cannot be construed into a serious criticism, for *Ruy Blas* does not represent the battle-ground, but the stronghold captured and beautified, and it must be treated as such.

All of Hugo's works are full of historical allusions and references to incidents and traditions of medieval lore which must be understood, otherwise the true meaning of many a significant passage is lost. This author differs in this respect from other writers; he is consciously medieval in his literary thinking, or he strives to be so; his aim is to resuscitate the past, and it therefore becomes the editor's duty to show in how far the author has been true to his purpose. But here peculiar difficulties at once present themselves. True literary greatness has perhaps never been coupled with a more absolute *terre-à-terre* conception of literary honesty and scientific charlatanism than in Hugo; nobody would be disposed to quarrel with him, had he used history for his literary purposes without making pretense to historical accuracy and without willfully beclouding the conceptions of his readers. The famous reference to the Chron-